DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 516 FL 007 514

AUTHOR Rickford, John R.
TITLE How Does "Doz" Disappear? (Or: Where Are the Creolists When the Creoles Most Need Them?)
PUB DATE Jan 75
NOTE 32p.; To appear in Proceedings of the 1975 International Conference on Pidgins and Creoles, U. of Hawaii, late 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.00 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Creoles; *Dialect Studies; Discourse Analysis; English; Negro Dialects; Nonstandard Dialects; *Phonetic Analysis; *Phonology; Regional Dialects
IDENTIFIERS *Guyana

ABSTRACT

In Guyana Creolese, the word "doz" appears frequently in the speech of people on a wide range of social levels. The term signals that the action occurs habitually. The use of "doz" is not widely noted among creolists, however, possibly because it often occurs in phonologically reduced forms such as "Iz" or "z." The reduction of "doz" is more than rapid speech; it helps approximate the prestigious standard dialect or acrolect. The process achieves linguistic progress without sacrificing expressive value. The removal of the "d" from "doz" in this reduction is part of a general rule affecting initial voiced segments in creole auxiliaries or tense-aspect markers. The "d" is retained 100% of the time after a pause, 69% after vowels and 60% or less after consonants. The removal of "d" following nasals, liquids, stops, fricatives and vowels is examined. Other creole dialects and black U.S. English are searched for similar examples of deletion. The deletion of the vowel in "doz" occurs after an immediately preceding vowel but never after a consonant. If the "z" is also deleted, use of the remaining verb stem for habitual aspect is indistinguishable from Standard English use of present tense. (CHK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119516

HOW DOES DOZ DISAPPEAR? (OR: WHERE ARE THE CREOLISTS WHEN THE CREOLES MOST NEED THEM?)

by

John R. Rickford
University of Pennsylvania
and
University of Guyana

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John R. Rickford
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

(Draft of a paper to be presented at the International Conference on Pidgins and Creoles, Honolulu, Hawaii, January 1975. Comments and criticisms welcome.)

Mailing Address:
Linguistics Section
Department of English
University of Guyana
P.O. Box 841 GEORGETOWN
Guyana South America

FL007514

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

TO APPEAR IN: BICKERTON, DEREK, and RICHARD DAY (eds.)
PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1975 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PIDGINS and CREOLES
U of Hawaii Press, Honolulu

HOW DOES DOZ DISAPPEAR? (OR: WHERE ARE THE CREOLISTS WHEN THE CREOLES MOST NEED THEM ?)

John R. Rickford
University of Pennsylvania
and
University of Guyana

In Guyana Creolese, sentences like the following can be heard frequently: [1]

(1) dI gjal dəz traI tə sma:t di baI, an dI baI dəz traI tə sma:t di gjal.
"The girls usually try to outsmart the boys, and the boys usually try to outsmart the girls"

Unlike Standard English does, the doz in sentences of this type occurs with weak stress, and is clearly not an emphatic but an iterative marker, signalling that the action referred to in the verb occurs repeatedly or habitually.

Not only does doz occur with high frequency, but it shows up in the speech of a wide range of social or "socio-linguistic" types. Doz would have to be defined as a mesolectal marker, insofar as there exist alternate means of marking the habitual or repeated occurence of an action which are on the one hand, closer to Standard English (acrolectal), and on the other, even more different from it (basilectal). The basilectal marker is a (also used for continuative aspect), and the acrolectal system involves the use of the Verb stem alone or the S.E. Present tense. But the mesolectal span of doz is particularly broad.

For instance, basilectal speakers are distinguished from mesolectal ones, not by the fact that they use no doz, but that the relative frequency of doz in their speech is less than that of a.[2] Here for example, are the relative frequencies of doz and a as used for iterative aspect, in the speech of Baby Sookhia, an old East Indian woman now retired after working for over fifty years on "creole gang" in the cane-fields (weeding, trashing cane, etc.). Her output is typically basilectal:

a = 57 (81.4%) doz = 13 (18.6%)

We find the same relationship in table 2.1 which displays the basilectal outputs of twenty Guyanese speakers, in Bickerton (forthcoming). This table is reprinted below as Table 1. Note that there are only five speakers whose tape-recorded speech did not include any doz tokens. The other fifteen all have some doz, but regularly use more a than doz : the total frequencies are doz : 100, a: 732. [3] Note though that doz does occur with some frequency - more often than the truly basilectal bin (49 tokens) and bina (35). There is a valid explanation for this - as Bickerton (ibid) points out, these latter markers are used only in contexts which are rare in ordinary discourse. But the point remains - doz is the second most frequent non-standard marker in this basilectal sample. While it is outstripped by a , in the basilect, it cannot be ignored or cast aside.

At the other extreme are acrolectal speakers, who prefer to use the S.E. Present tense for expressing habitual aspect, as in:

(2) They go home everyday

Speaker	-s	-ED	be	-ing	doz	don	bina	bin	a
2				3	1	1		1	21
9			1	2	21	7	2	3	128
15			1	1	7	3	1		26
24							1		18
25				1		1	1		31
27		2	8	2	2	2		4	42
28					14	5		4	55
118							2	3	28
129							2	4	16
137			2	3	3	1	7	6	9
148	2		1				1	4	22
168		1	6		5	3			44
170				1	8	2		1	11
172				1	2	9			15
176					12	6		1	39
178				1	6	3		5	56
186		2	13	10	1		2		38
188					9	3	9	9	94
198				1	8		2	10	15
219					1		5	1	24
TOTALS	2	5	32	26	100	49	35	56	732

Total standard forms:65 Total nonstandard forms:972.

Table 1: Basilectal Outputs of Twenty Guyanese speakers (= Table 2.1 in Bickerton forthcoming).

But even these speakers will use doz. Somewhat like the basilectal speakers, it is the lower frequency of doz, relative to some other means of signalling iterative aspect ("Present tense" in this case) which distinguishes them. Here for example are the frequencies of doz versus Present tense forms used for iterative aspect in the speech of Pandit Ramnarine, an educated and respected member of his village, who was conducting a fairly formal interview:

doz: 15 (17.4%) Present Tense: 71 (82.6%)

In fact doz is very tenacious indeed. Of the five non-standard markers represented in table 1 (doz, bin, bina, don and a), doz is the only one which acrolectal or upper mesolectal speakers will continue to use quite freely in their informal speech, even while they eschew all the others.

So far I have been trying to establish the frequency with which doz occurs in Guyana. But doz-usage is not confined to Guyana. The form has been reported for Barbados (Collymore 1965), Trinidad (Solomon 1968) and the Bay Islands (Ryan 1973). My own investigations have revealed that it is alive and well in the South Carolina Sea Islands, in Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis and Belize. I am sure that it can be found elsewhere in the Caribbean. In Alison Shilling's paper for this conference, for instance, we learn that it is also current in the Bahamas!

We may safely conclude then that doz is a well-attested and important creole feature in the "English-speaking" Caribbean.

However, while doz may be a household word in these creole communities, it has not yet become so in creolist circles.

The form received passing reference only in Collymore (op cit), Solomon (op cit) and Ryan (op cit), and in somewhat more detail in Bickerton (1973) and Rickford (1974). It is certainly not generally considered one of the classic features of an English creole - on a level with bin or mi or a - and this despite the fact that it may well enjoy wider currency than these other features.

This brings me to the sub-title of this paper. Where are the creolists when the creoles most need them? Why has doz - so central a feature in creole communities - been thus ignored?

One possible answer is of course to say that doz is only one of several fascinating creole features (sa, neva, did, again are others) that have suffered from the paucity of descriptive creole studies (in whatever framework) in the field. Contrary to what many people seem to feel, we still have a great deal to discover about what features individual creoles exhibit, quite apart from all the very interesting speculation about where they came from, where they're going to, and so on.

Another possible explanation may have to do with the fact that most of the active work on Caribbean English creoles has taken place in Jamaica. Now I still have not ruled out the possibility that doz may turn up there, but so far I haven't received any evidence that it is current there. If doz does not in fact show up anywhere in Jamaica, this would be an interesting discovery, leading us to question in the first place the extent to which we could continue to view Jamaican

Creole as the proto-typical Caribbean creole, and in the second, to seek out the historical and other factors which might explain this unique situation.

But there is surely more to this issue than the coincidence that the crowd was at one place and the action at another. There have been scholars interested in language in other parts of the Caribbean (certainly there has been no shortage on the S. Carolina Sea Islands). And they have brought back the usual creole treasures - binsand mis and das and as.

The treasures which creolists seek, and find, in creole communities, have always been the most basilectal items possible- the real "raa taak", the varieties furthest removed from the standard language. In fact, many of us conceive of the term "creole" as referring only to some invariant conglomeration of basilectal items.[4]

Given this kind of attitude and approach, it is easy to see how doz might have been ignored, in the light of the existence of basilectal a. But as I hope this paper has already made clear - in neglecting doz, we would be neglecting a crucial aspect of the linguistic competence of the creole community. (For more on the neglected insights of the mesolect, cf. Rickford op. cit.).

Another reason why doz may have been overlooked is that it often occurs in phonologically reduced forms- əz, Iz, and even z. Out of a total of 215 doz tokens examined for this paper, doz was realised in its full form only 62% of the time. Furthermore, many of the occurences of əz or Iz reduced from

doz might easily be mistaken for instances of the English copula.

Surprisingly enough, very little work has been done on the nature of phonological reduction or morphological condensation in creole communities. The reduction of doz is only one instance of a tremendous amount of phonological reduction and loss which is extremely typical of everyday speech in creole communities. It is this general phenomenon which makes creole speech virtually unintelligible at times - even when the syntactic and lexical levels are fairly standard.

But if we cannot hear reduced forms of doz as doz, reduced forms of bin or gonna as bin and gonna , we can hardly do any "fully accountable" descriptions of creole syntax, not to mention phonology.[5] An understanding of the principal types of phonological reduction which obtain in creole communities would clearly be of considerable practical as well as theoretical value - yet it has rarely been attempted.

The point should also be made here that the condensation of doz seems to be more than the automatic consequence of rapid speech, and seems to provide for more than an enrichment of the range of stylistic possibilities .[6] It systematically provides a means of approximating the prestigious standard dialect or acrolect with a minimum of effort, yielding intermediate and final forms which seem closer to the desired goal while at the same time can be related to and used like their non-standard source. For instance, Iz, a reduced variant of doz seems more standard than doz (it is phonetically identical with the 3rd person

singular form of the copula). But even while the speaker might feel that he had"progressed" from the more non-standard doz, he does not suffer semantic or syntactic discomfort in the process - for his Iz iterative marker functions both syntactically and semmantically just like doz. The more a speaker reduces doz, the more he is able to "pass" as controlling the formal machinery of a higher lect, while being able to draw at the same time on the semantic and expressive machinery which "lower" lects provide.

Just as one might utter a taboo word in condensed or virtually inaudible form, thus meeting requirements of propriety while still feeling to oneself that the expressive purpose had been served, I think the phonologically reduced forms of doz permit more self-conscious speakers to use the morpheme without doing so blatantly and obviously, and in a a way that might find accomodation among the "higher lects".

I think it is no accident that upper mesolectal speakers more frequently condense doz than basilectal or lower-mesolectal ones. For instance, Johnny Wade, an upper mesolectal speaker, realizes his doz tokens in full form only 20% of the time, while Sadhoo Naik, a basilectal speaker, produces his doz tokens in full form 83% of the time. The upper mesolectal speaker in a sense, tries to pass his non-standard doz off as a more "standard"-looking Iz or z . but the basilectal speaker is typically less concerned about trying to disguise or conceal his resources. He is more prepared to simply call a doz a doz.

If all of this is true, then it is clear that an understanding of how "decreolization" proceeds would require an understanding of how processes of phonological condensation like those attested for doz actually operate.

With these motivating considerations in mind, let us turn now to a more detailed discussion of the reduction of doz.

d- undoing of doz:

We shall concentrate most heavily on the "undoing" of the initial d in doz - the process by which it is deleted, often through assimilated intermediate forms (nəz, ləz etc.). There are well known precedents for the reduction of the əz which would remain after the d is removed, to z and even ø, in many English dialects.- the reduction of the English copula Iz to əz, prior to contraction and deletion forinstance.(Cf. Labov 1969 for a detailed examination of these processes in English in general, and Black English in particular).

But there are no equally well-known precedents for the deletion of initial voiced stops in English dialects. The closest parallel to the deletion of the initial d in doz is found only in words like this, that, those, the, them, etc. in which an initial ð becomes $d^{ð}$ or d before being removed, often through assimilation to the preceding element (cf. Cofer 1973).

As we shall soon see, however, the removal of the initial d in doz, far from being an isolated phenomenon, is part of a general rule affecting initial voiced segments in creole

auxiliaries or tense-aspect markers. But before we come to this general "pan-creole" rule, let us more modestly attempt to work out the rules which would provide for the undoing of d in doz.

Table 2 displays the frequency with which doz was realized as a full form (dʌz, dəz, sometimes daz or das) in a total of 215 sentences containing doz. One hundred and ninety-six of these were taken from tape-recorded interviews with twenty-one Guyanese speakers, and nineteen from two Sea-Island Creole speakers in the South Carolina area.[8]

	Pause__	Vowel__	Stop__	Fric.__	Nasal__	Liquid__	TOTAL
SIC	---	9/13=69%	---	0/1=0%	0/2=0%	0/3=0%	9/19=47%
GC	6/6=100%	95/138=69%	3/5=60%	2/3=67%	15/34=44%	4/10=40%	125/196=64%
To.	6/6=100%	104/151=69%	3/5=60%	2/4=50%	15/36=42%	4/13=31%	134/215=62%

Table 2: Frequency of full forms of doz according to preceding phonological environment, in SIC and GC.

On the whole, the SIC speakers have a somewhat lower degree of d retention than the GC speakers (47% as against 64%), but since the SIC community is at a more advanced stage of decreolization, this would accord with what I have already said about upper mesolectal and acrolectal speakers reducing doz more often than their basilectal counterparts.

On the surface, the SIC speakers also appear to have a simpler and more clear-cut rule than the GC speakers: delete ##d variably after vowels, and categorically elsewhere. But

the simplicity of this pattern is probably due to the paucity of data in non-vocalic environments (only five tokens). From other SIC data not tabulated here, SIC speakers do have some d-retention in non-vocalic environments, as in:

(2) ju no - so pipl dəz kʌm ovɛ jer...

"You know - some people come over here"

Their real pattern would thus appear to be quantitatively rather than qualitatively different from that of the GC speakers.

Ignoring for the present the minor differences between the two communities, we shall refer from this point on to the combined totals in table 2, exploiting all the data at our disposal. [9]

The overall picture of the contrasting effect of preceding phonological environments is simple enough to explain. Since we are dealing with the removal of a consonant, we would expect consonantal environments to favour the rule, and a preceding vowel or pause to disfavour it. (Compare the final t,d deletion rule, or the rule for deleting the remaining z once contraction has applied to the English copula - Labov et al 1968). And this is borne out in the data: 100% retention after pause, 69% after vowels, and 60% or less after consonants.

We can represent this general picture by a variable rule in which the relative contribution of each factor to the operation of the rule is expressed by its order in the hierarchy:

RULE I: d-undoing of doz:

$$d \longrightarrow (\emptyset) \Big/ \left\langle \begin{matrix} [\text{Liquid}] \\ [\text{nasal}] \\ [\text{fricative}] \\ [\text{stop}] \\ [\text{vowel}] \end{matrix} \right\rangle \#\#[_\text{VC}]\text{doz}$$

When we look at the data in the individual environments in turn, we find intermediate forms which allow us to establish the process of d-undoing of doz in finer detail. Preceding nasal environments furnish the richest set of intermediate forms, and we shall deal with them first, and in greater detail than the others.

Nasal__ :

The following different realizations of doz occur in nasal environments:

(3) m##dɔz : sʌm dəz sɪe an pak ap."Somestay and pack up"

(4) m##ɔz: dɛm Iz gat arkɛstrə de. "They usually have orchestras there".

(5) n##doz: dɛn dəz plant stʌmp lang taim. "They used to plant stumps long ago".

(6) n##nɔz: sʌmtaIm di lan nəz hard. "Sometimes the land is hard".

(7) Ø #nəz: dɛnəz pʌn əm. "They (usually) pound it"

(8) n##əz: di graUn Iz drɔəm "The ground draws it"

(9) ɲ##ɲəz: di tIɲ ɲəz spIn. "The thing spins".

As example (3) indicates, one possibility is for doz to remain in itsfull form without any compensating changes in the preceding nasal. But one other alternative (illustrated in (5) in which the underlying subject pronoun is dɛm) is for the doz to remain in full form while the preceding nasal assimilates to the coronal articulation of the initial d: This may be handled by the rule:

RULE II: Nasal assimilation to Point of articulation of following segment:

$$[+\text{nasal}] \longrightarrow \left(\begin{bmatrix}\alpha\text{anterior}\\ \beta\text{coronal}\end{bmatrix}\right) / __\ \#\# \begin{bmatrix}\alpha\text{anterior}\\ \beta\text{coronal}\end{bmatrix}$$

This fairly general rule of English, which will produce rIbm bo from "ribbon bow", Hawaiin Creole m, n, and n from "wen", angana from "I'm going to", will also handle the specific case of doz with which we are concerned.

The other possibility, represented by (6) and (9), in which the initial stop is itself assimilated to the preceding nasal, is unusual in English, and must be represented by a more restricted rule:

RULE III: Assimilation of stop to preceding nasal:

$$[-\text{continuant}] \longrightarrow \left(\begin{bmatrix}+\text{nasal}\\ \alpha\text{coronal}\\ \beta\text{anterior}\end{bmatrix}\right) / \begin{bmatrix}+\text{nasal}\\ \alpha\text{coronal}\\ \beta\text{anterior}\end{bmatrix} \#\#[\ __VC]_{doz}$$

The outputs of RULE III may be further reduced, as examples (2) and (8) indicate, by the more general rule:

RULE IV: Simplification of geminates:

$$X_i \longrightarrow (\emptyset) \ / \ X_i\#\#__$$

Example (7) is especially interesting. The subject pronoun (dəm) has lost its final nasal: the lone nasal in the subject verb sequence is clearly part of the habitual marker (nəz). We could account for this by a possible RULE IV' applying to the output of II and III:

RULE IV': Simplification of Geminates:

$$X_i \longrightarrow (\emptyset) \quad _\#\#X_i$$

The most obvious objection to this rule is that it would have the exact opposite effect of RULE IV as it stands: i.e. it would remove the first of two adjacent identical segments rather than the second. But apart from the ad hoc nature of such a formulation, RULE IV' would not allow speakers to produce either (7) or (8), as speakers in fact do.

A better way of accounting for (8) is by RULE V:

RULE V: Resyllabification:

$$[..\text{nasal}_i]_{\text{Pro}}\#\#[\emptyset\text{VC}]_{\text{doz}} \longrightarrow [..\emptyset]_{\text{Pro}}\#\#[\text{nasal}_i\text{VC}]_{\text{doz}}$$

RULE V would allow the generation of both (7) and (8), and is further justified by the fact that dem, dɛm, de and dɛ are all pronominal variants in mesolectal levels of creole. It appears that, given the output of RULE IV (e.g. dɛn əz), and somehow still feeling the need for an initial consonant on what was originally doz, speakers resyllabify - transferring the nasal from the pronoun to the habitual marker. This option is made possible by the existence of dɛ as a pronominal variant.

Here are some sample derivations for underlying dɛm##dəz, which can go two possible routes, and for underlying lan##dəz, which can only go one. Note that while dɛm##məz and dɛ##məz are not actually attested in the recorded data, dɛm##əz is attested, and the former two, which would precede and follow this in the derivation, seem intuitively possible where something

like *la##nəz does not.

	dɛm##dəz	dɛm##dəz	lan##dəz
RII	Option not taken	dɛn##dəz	Vacuous application
RIII	dɛm##məz	dɛn##nəz	lan##nəz
RIV	dɛm##əz	dɛn##əz	lan##əz
RV	dɛ##məz	dɛ##nəz	Not applicable

Liquid—

In the case of preceding liquids, we find evidence for some of the very processes which operate in nasal environments. In no event is the subject NP affected, but doz itself may be modified as in:

(10) l##ləz: pipl ləz plenti he "There are usually plenty of people here"

(11) l##æz: pɪpl Iz bi baIjIn sun: "People usually start buying soon"

(10) may be accounted for by amending RII to provide for assimilation of the stop to a preceding sonorant instead of a nasal. (11) requires no further modification of RULE IV.

Stop— and Fricative—:

Preceding stops and fricatives simply do not provide enough data to allow us to work out finer processes with any reliability. The two non-full forms of doz which occur after stops are:

(12) dem wId strɛŋk nəz wʌk "Those with the strength work"

(13) Gad ɒz drim i waIf "God makes his wife dream..."

In view of examples like (7) above, (12) could probably be derived by allowing RULE III to operate as a distant assimilati rule. From (13), and the fact that all the full forms of doz are preceded by t## (naIt dəz; pa:t dəz, wat dʌz), we must assume that d-undoing takes place most often in stop environments by a process of geminate simplification, when the preceding stop happens itself to be d.

In the fricative environments, no intermediate forms of doz (*səz or *zəz for instance) are attested, and we are not therefore justified in positing some modified form of the assimilation rule III for fricatives. However, in both cases in which the ##d is deleted, the preceding fricative is a sibilant (a:lwIz Iz, perənts æz), suggesting that sibilants perhaps trigger the operation more often than other fricatives.

Vowel—

No finer rules can be established as to how preceding vowels function in d-undoing of doz. Tense vs. lax, front vs. back - none of these nor any other distinctions seem to correlate with any greater or less deletion. There is at least one case of an initial ð instead of d in doz, and several cases in which the d is more tenuous (which we might write as ^{d}əz). These suggest that a process of weakening often takes place as a prelude to, or instead of total deletion.

The deletion of initial Aux. stops - a Pan-Creole rule:

We have now covered the general, and as far as possible, the specific processes by which the initial d in doz is removed. As was mentioned before, this seems at first like a rare phenomenon in "English" dialects. But when we examine other English creoles and "decreolized" dialects such as Black English, we discover several other similar cases.

In Sea-Island Creole, for instance, the basilectal continuative/habitual marker is normally da, as in:

(14) shi mʌsi da hʌnt hʌzbən - "She must be hunting for a husband"

However, da alternates with a after bIn

(15) bai, andi bina hala - "Boy, Andy was hollering"

Note that bIn ends in a nasal - and as we have already seen in the case of doz - preceding nasals provide one of the most favourable environments for the deletion of the initial stop via assimilation.

In Guyana and Jamaica, only a is used for the basilectal continuative/iterative marker. It is very likely that this is a derived form of an earlier da, and that the complete loss of ##d was preceded by a da/a alternation such as exists in SIC today.

bIn - a marker of anterior aspect or past tense in almost all the Atlantic creoles, provides another example - the first to suggest that the deletion rule is not limited to dentals or alveolars, but extends to all voiced stops. The form occurs

as mIn in Antigua, and St. Kitts, wen in Hawaiian Creole, en in Jamaican Creole. The variants themselves suggest the diachronic processes which might have been involved: nasalization of the initial b, lenition to a glide, complete deletion of the initial segment.

It should be added here that the pronominal morphology of creoles is likely to have played some part in the development of these processes, given that the effect of a preceding nasal is always so strong. Unlike the S.E. subject pronouns, none of which ends in a nasal, at least one (dem - third person plural) and frequently another (Im - third person singular, as in Jamaica) of the creole subject pronouns end in nasals. Add to this the fact that it is pronouns which occur most frequently of the NPs before the auxiliary, and that third person pronouns occur with particular frequency, and it can be seen how the process of initial stop assimilation and deletion might have been facilitated by the regular occurrence of favourable environments.

GC and SIC furnish yet another example of initial stop deletion in the alternation of bi and i - most widely demonstrated in the use of mʌs##i for "must be", as in (14) above. I have also been told that an alternation between go and o exists in Sranan - but do not yet have any further details.

The final three examples come from Black English. The fact that they are peculiar to Black dialects in the U.S. has frequently been noted, but no explanations have been offered for their idiosyncracy.

Labov et al (1968: 255-7) point out that the use of ain't for didn't, and the realization of don't as simply a nasal vowel ɔ̃ or ɷ̃ or õ, differentiates Black non-standard dialects from White non-standard ones, but offer no rules for such alternations, stating that this would require "further investigation". Undoubtedly it does. But it seems clear that to provide for the use of ain't for didn't and a nasal vowel for don't, we would require rules deleting the initial voiced segment - the same phenomenon we witness in the Caribbean creole auxiliaries. Note too that where the basilect has no or na, the GC mesolect uses en, ɛn, In, n or ən for the acrolectal forms didn't and don't. The B.E. situation is therefore not as unfamiliar as it might at first appear.

Black English furnishes an additional example that the deletion rule might apply to all kinds of voiced stops: ##b, ##d, ##g. The example in question is the possible reduction of (I) am going to in B.E. to mən, mnə and mə. Ignoring the earlier stages which are irrelevant to this discussion, we may enter the derivation provided by Labov et al (ibid: 251-2) at mgənə. The authors point out that the BE sub-path on the reduction route from this point on " is unusual, involving as it does, the assimilation of the stop to the nasal - unusual in English, but the rule in other languages such as Korean." [10] The derivation for the B.E. sub-path runs as follows:

(16) mgənə

(17) mməne : assimilation of stop to nasal

(18) mene : simplification of geminates

(19) mnɑ : - elision

(20) mmə : assimilation of nasal to preceding nasal

(21) mə : simplification of geminates

Before we turn to languages as distant as Korean for precedents - note how closely the processes involved in (16) to (21) parallel Rules II to IV devised for doz above.

Each of these cases merits further individual investigation to see what specific role phonological environments play in the deletion of their initial segments. But we can capture the general nature of the phenomenon in a preliminary way (much as we did with RULE I above) by the "pan-creole" rule:[11]

RULE VI: DELETION OF INITIAL VOICED STOPS IN AUX.

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\text{continuant} \\ +\text{voiced} \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow (\emptyset) \;\; \#\#\, [__ VC_0]_{Aux}$$

We still need to find out a lot more about the possible application and non-application of this rule (for instance, why no single creole seems to allow it to apply to all the cases discussed in this section; why certain possible candidates for this rule, like anterior or past dId seem never to be affected in any creole, etc.). But the need for some rule like RULE VI seems incontrovertible.

Loss of the Vowel in (d)oz:

Let us now return to the specific case of doz. We have provided now for the removal of its initial segment, after which the variant forms remaining consist of Vz (əz and Iz are the most common realizations).

But further condensation can occur - the lone vowel can itself be removed, leaving a vestigial z to mark iterative or habitual aspect. Our discussion of this step will not be as involved as our discussion of the removal of initial d, because the patterns represented here are much more transparent. Table 3 for instance, displays the relative frequency of z out of all z and Vz tokens, according to preceding phonological environment (i.e. the relative frequency of z out of all forms in which the initial segment has been removed) in the speech of the seven Guyanese speakers I recorded myself:

	Pause (n=0)	Vowel (n=42)	Stop (n=2)	Fric (n=1)	Nas (n=5)	Liq. (n=3)	TOTAL (n=53)
z:	-	.74	.0	.0	.0	.0	.58

Table 3: Relative Frequency of z out of Vz + z tokens : GC, according to preceding phonological environment.

The pattern revealed in table 3 is totally unambiguous: further reduction of doz to z occurs only after a vowel. Not only are z forms unattested in the other environments in the data, but intuitively they seem quite unlikely: While da brɛd əz hard or di pipl əz wʌk have iterative interpretations ("The bread is usually hard" and "The people work"), da brɛdz hard could only mean "That bread is hard", and di piplz wʌk "the people's work".

Since the process involves the removal of a vowel, it is natural to expect that an immediately preceding vowel would favour it. But the apparent impossibility of any such reduction after consonants is not what we might normally expect. The restriction on the reduction of (d)oz to z to vocalic environments effectively helps to distinguish the iterative marker from the English copula(which can be contracted, albeit less frequently than in vocalic environments, in consonantal environments as well).

In the condensation of iterative doz, then, we see the deceptiveness of first appearances. The removal of the initial voiced stop seemed at first to be an unprecedented phenomenon, but turned out to part of a widespread process in the English creoles. The reduction of iterative Iz or əz seemed at first to involve nothing more than the processes involved in the widely attested contraction and deletion of the English copula, but turns out to be subtly different.

Within the category of preceding vowels, I have not as yet been able to establish any internal constraints on the reduction of (d)oz to z. So we mustsimply account for this kind of reduction by the optional rule:

RULE VII: VOWEL ELISION IN ITERATIVE VZ FORMS

$$V \longrightarrow (\emptyset) \;/\; V\#\# \left[\underset{*iter}{_z} \right]$$

The final disappearance of doz

If the lone z (remaining after RULE VII has applied) or the əz (in those cases in which RULE VII does NOT apply) were to be deleted, the effect would be the complete disappearance of iterative doz. As a corollary of this, the invariant verb-stem form which is used after doz would emerge as the new means of signalling the repeated or habitual occurence of an action. For example, the sentence

(22) wi (ə)z go der

would, by the simple deletion of the (ə)z, become

(22') wi go der ..

Note that the use of the Verb-stem alone (as in 22') to signal habitual aspect would correspond almost exactly with the S.E. use of "present tense" forms. The only area in which we might be able to distinguish one from the other would be where the subject NP was "third person singular"- for here the "V-stem" form would be Verb and the "Present tense"form would be Verb +s. But since complete mastery of the S.E. inflectional morphology is characteristic only of the very highest "lects" in the creole continuum, this difference might easily be discounted. Essentially, therefore, we must conclude that a system of "Verb -stem" for marking habitual aspect is indistinguishable from the S.E. system of "Present tense" for more or less the same function, and that the mesolectal speaker could "acquire" this particular aspect of the acrolectal machinery simply by carrying his already active condensation of doz to its furthest limit. That is - he does not

have to "learn" an entirely new system of expressing habitual aspect. To achieve the required "Present Tense" forms, he simply has to extend condensation / processes which have already been "nibbling away" at his old habitual marker doz, in such a way that they swallow it altogether.[14]

Furthermore, this system in which a verb-stem alone is used to represent the habitual occurence of an action will not be entirely new to the creole speaker. For in both basilectal and mesolectal varieties of GC, doz is subject to a general aspect deletion rule first pointed out by Bickerton 1972:

> " Aspect markers are deleted obligatorily in temporal and conditional clauses, in generic statements ('the sun rises in the morning') and before performatives and 'phatic' higher verbs such as 'you know', 'I mean', 'you see', etc.). They are deleted optionally (but with high frequency, and perhaps obligatorily for some speakers) before modals, non-finites, and in any sentence with non-specific reference - 'people eat fish' as against 'John does eat fish'." (p.9)

To illustrate the operation of this rule, Bickerton provides two passages, a section of one of which is reprinted here (bracketed letters after each "unmarked" verb indicate the reason for omitting doz : T= temporal clause, HV = higher verb, NF = nonfinite, S = stative, M= modal):

> "But you see (HV) most of them in the scheme, when you

see(T) they drink(NF) a quarter, they want (S) the public to know they drink(?). They begin (M) rev-up and go-'long so people does say them is drinkman..."

It would not be too far removed a system to permit doz to disappear also (probably by the reduction route) in other environments, such as when "habitual" adverbs like "usually", "always", "sometimes" etc. are present (in fact the S.E. forms signal "habitual" most strongly when these are present), and eventually everywhere.

The hypothesis that Guyanese speakers' use of the SE present tense , or "Verb stem", to express habitual aspect is often derived from a final deletion of z or -z is in many ways an attractive one. But we cannot really document the operation of any such process without achieving circularity, since we have no way of distinguishing contexts in which -z or z is deleted from cases in which doz may not have existed at all. The synchronic problem is also reflected diachronically: in those creoles which use Verb-stem as habitual marker, can we infer earlier stages in which doz was used, but eventually deleted? Without documentary or other evidence, such a step might be difficult to justify.

In Black English, however, there seems to be more justification for positing the earlier existence of doz, in the light of the present existence of "Invariant be" as an iterative or habitual marker. I have argued this position at length elsewhere (Rickford op cit), so will

offer only a brief summary here. Essentially, the argument is this: sentences like "He be working", "He be sick", "He be in the club" which occur with iterative meaning in Black English, would result automatically if doz were deleted and lost completely from the equivalent creole structures: "He doz be working", "He doz be sick", "He doz be in the club" and these very structures are attested alongside the be forms amongst Black Americans on the Sea Islands. When doz finally disappears, its iterative function is transferred to the following be.

An interesting question is why "invariant be" has not, so far as I know, been adopted as iterative marker in"decreolized lects outside of American Black English. In Guyana, I have collected this single example (which seems clearly to be derived from a deleted doz):

(23) These days the sun be down fast. But August i gon steady back. "In these days (i.e. November month) the sun goes ("does be") down fast. But in August it will become steady again (i.e. it will go down later)".

But be never becomes a stable part of the grammar, attested on a general scale. One reason for this may have to do with the tenacity of doz - if only in highly condensed form - among Guyanese speakers. I think a precondition for the emergence of invariant be as iterative marker would be that doz is so frequently deleted in toto in the community, that the "dummy" be could be reinterpreted as the real iterative signal. This

is not (yet?) the situation in the Caribbean creoles, although it is more so on the Sea Islands, where be is rapidly replacing doz be.

Another explanation may be that in some environments, there is not always a "dummy" be to take over the habitual function of doz if the latter is lost. GC adjectives, for instance, often behave more like verbs than true adjectives, and frequently occur after doz (and other auxiliaries) without be, as in:

(24) Shi doz sIk plẽnti " She gets sick often"

Obviously, if there is no be in such environments when doz is present, no transfer of the iterative function can take place after doz is deleted.

In closing:

How doz disappears, when it does so, with what effects, how we know it does so - these are some of the fascinating and difficult questions with which Caribbean creole communities present us. The "answers" which I attempted to provide in this paper are clearly not definitive. But hopefully they will encourage other creolists to join the fray.

***

NOTES:

* I wish to thank C.J. Bailey, Derek Bickerton, William Labov and William S.Y. Wang for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. As usual, they should not be held responsible for its defects.

[1]Sentences will be recorded in a broad phonetic transcription. I continue to use the form doz adopted by Bickerton (1972) when making general reference to the iterative morpheme. In fact however, the phonetic realizations of this morpheme are dəz , dʌz, sometimes das, daz. Of these dəz is the most frequent in the data, and I shall therefore use the schwa in derivations, and ' when making reference to condensed forms of doz.

[2]Basilectal and lower-mesolectal speakers are also frequently distinguished from upper mesolectal ones by the fact that their doz is unmarked for time or tense. Whereas mesolectal speakers typically use doz only for iterative non-past events (and useta for iterative past), basilectal speakers have no such restriction. For instance, in response to the question " What kind of work you used to do when you were small?", Baby Sookhia responds: watə dam bed, ken tap - den dʌz plant stʌmp lang taIm, an ju watə stʌmp an ting. " Water dam beds, cane tops - they used to plant stumps long ago, and you had to water the stumps and so on".

This difference in the tense marking of doz is an interesting subject, but is not really pertinent to this paper, and will not be discussed further.

[4]In this regard, folk-usage may provide a more realistic and useful model. In Guyana, for instance, "creolese" is used to refer to a wide range of varieties short of the "acrolect" (or most Standard-like variety).

[5]Labov 1971 cites the extreme difficulty which researchers working on Hawaiian Creole experienced in trying to transcribe auxiliaries which occurred in reduced form: "Condensation of the auxiliaries is so extreme that the outside listener often does not perceive the relevant bits of sound, and thinks tht he is hearing zero forms.."

[6]I am alluding here to an intriguing suggestion made by Labov (ibid) that one reason for the replacement of adverbs of time by tense auxiliaries in many creoles, is that the latter, appearing in a wider range of variant condensed forms, offer more scope for stylistic variation.

[7]C.J. Bailey (personal communication) has pointed out that examples like ənə for "on the", ɔlə for "all the" (where n and l are interdental) are quite frequent in "standard American colloquial English".

[8]Forty-one of the Gc tokens were taken from interviews with fourteen Guyanese speakers, conducted by Bickerton and his field-assistants. I am indebted to him for the opportunity to draw on this data. The remaining 155 GC doz tokens were taken from longer interviews with seven Guyanese speakers whom I recorded myself in July - September 1974. The SIC data was recorded on one of the Sea Islands in summer 1972.

[9]Note that the ordering of the environments in terms of their effect on d-deletion is the same whether we use the GC totals or the combined GC/SIC totals, except for the relative position of Fric__ and Stop__. However, these two environments yield the least number of doz tokens anyhow (4, and 5) - so we could not be very confident about their relative position anyway.

[10]C.J. Bailey has furnished the following examples - plen(t)y, twen(t)y, cen(t)er, win(t)er to suggest that the assimilation of the stop to the nasal is not in fact unusual in English. But these examples do not involve assimilation across a morpheme or word boundary, and seem less close to the case of am going to than the other creole examples discussed in this section, which all involve mebers of Aux.

[11]Since there are no auxiliary or tense aspect markers in the creoles beginning with an affricate, -continuant will suffice to cover the actualcases with initial voiced stops. Alternatively, we could use Schane's (1973) feature of -delayed release to exclude affricates, but this feature does not appear to be as well-established or agreed upon.

The role of Aux in the rule (i.e. the fact that all the words to which the rule applies occur in preverbal environment, and could thus be treated as members of Aux) is probably to be explained by the fact that members of Aux. can all occur with weak stress. (Cf. Labov 1971).

[12]__z refers to forms in which the initial d is assimilated to the preceding consonant (e.g. nɐz), or in which it appears as ʔ after a vowel.

[13]As Charleston (1955) and others have pointed out, the so-called "Present Tense" of English usually indicates the general or habitual occurence of an action, and only in specialized speech-events like sports commentaries does it refer to an action taking place at the moment of speaking. Of course, it is also true that the habitual function is most fully marked by Present tense forms when they co-occur with adverbials like "usually", "sometimes" etc.

[14]In a comment on an earlier draft of this paper, Bickerton says :

"I think it is questionable which is responsible

> for the final disappearance of doz - phonological attrition, or simply the realization that it's a non-standard marker - i.e. just that decreolization process that originated doz in the first place (when it replaces a, that is - JR) is responsible for its disappearance".

But I don't think there is any crucial opposition between these two viewpoints. Granted a "realization" that doz is "non-standard", the speaker can "decreolize" most simply, as I argue in this section, by allowing his condensation rules for doz to apply a step further.